

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10, 12-19, and 21-24 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 12 are amended, and claims 23 and 24 are added. No new matter is added. Reconsideration in view of the following Amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

A. The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-10, 12, 14-19, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,677,575 to Maeta et al. (Maeta) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,519,576 to Moore. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia* that a region in which an adhesive is disposed includes a first region of low adhesion with the adhesive and a second region of high adhesion with the adhesive, and the area of the first region is equal to or larger than the area of the second region. This feature is described in the specification at, for example, page 24, lines 19-26. As described in the specification at, for example, page 15, line 24 - page 16, line 6, since the adhesive 30 has a high adhesion with the region of the base material of the substrate 10 in which the leads 12 and film 14 are not formed, it forms a strong bond between the substrate 10 and the semiconductor chip 20. However, because the adhesive 30 adheres to the leads 12 and film 14 with a low adhesion force, voids and holes tend not to form on the surface of the leads 12 and film 14. As a result, the accumulation of moisture in voids and holes can be prevented, and the reliability can be increased.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the applied prior art teaches or suggests this feature or advantage. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably distinct from the applied prior art.

Claim 3-10 are allowable at least for their dependence on allowable claim 1.

Claim 12 includes features similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is also patentably distinct from the applied prior art.

Claims 14-19, 21 and 22 are allowable at least for their dependence on claim 12.

As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

B. The Office Action rejects claims 1-10, 12-19, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,804,882 to Tsukagoshi et al. (Tsukagoshi) in view of Moore. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the applied prior art teaches or suggests the features described above in relation to claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 12 are patentably distinct from the applied prior art.

Claims 2-10, 13-19, 21 and 22 are allowable at least for their dependence on an allowable base claim.

As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

C. The Office Action rejects claims 2 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Maeta in view of Moore and further in view of JP-07169795 to Oda. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Maeta and Moore do not teach or suggest the features described above. Oda does not overcome the deficiencies of Maeta and Moore. As such, claims 2 and 13 are allowable at least for their dependence on allowable base claims.

D. Claims 23 and 24 are added.

Claims 23 and 24 each recite that a plurality of leads includes a first lead on a substrate and a second lead which is closest to the first lead on the substrate and a part of the film is put between the first and second leads. This feature is shown in, for example, Fig. 6. This feature in combination with other claimed features is not taught in the applied references. As such, these claims are allowable at least for their dependence on an allowable base claim and for the additional features recited therein.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-10, 12-19, 21-24 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Stephen P. Catlin  
Registration No. 36,101

JAO:KXH/can

Date: July 25, 2003

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--